



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/733,162 | 12/11/2003 | Bruce Michael Siebers | KCX-651 (18385) | 5959 |
| 22827 7590 09/17/2008 DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| COLE, ELIZABETH M | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1794 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 09/17/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,162

Applicant(s)

SIEBERS ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth M. Cole

Art Unit

1794

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-21, 23 and 25-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-21, 23 and 25-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/14/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0066463 in view of Srinivasan et al, U.S Patent NO. 6,025,050, Currie et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,429,854 and Vinson et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,830,317, and further in view of EP 1212974. . EP '463 discloses a cleaning sheet comprising a plurality of plies of cellulosic material. An interlayer of an impermeable film can be placed between the cellulosic plies. See page 4, lines 32-34; page 5, lines 22-32. The layers can be joined by adhesive or thermal bonding. See page 8, lines 1-19. The plies of cellulosic material comprise a plurality of perforations. The perforations have a size of 0.01-1.2 mm. The perforations are distributed at a rate of 0.5-5 perforations per square centimeter. See page 9, lines 1-13. The apertures can extend through less than the entire thickness of the cleaning sheet. See page 6, lines 9-12. The perforations can extend from one or both sides of the cleaning sheet. See page 8, lines 28-32. One side of the cleaning sheet can comprise a plurality of abrasive structures such as fibers which are bonded to one of the cellulosic plies. Suitable materials for the abrasive fibers include polystyrene, polymethyl methacrylate and polyvinyl chloride. See page 10, lines 15-26. The cleaning sheet may be impregnated with various additives such as soap, detergent, disinfectants, skin treatments, etc. See page 3, lines

11-16. The size and depth of the perforations can be controlled to allow for a metered release of the added components. See page 3, lines 17-23. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing pins to form the perforations, (see page 8, lines 20-32), it does not teach that the pins are heated, which would produce perforations which enhance the structural integrity of the layered material. Srinivasan teaches at col. 1, lines 30-35, that it is conventional to form apertured nonwoven fabrics by aperturing using hot pin perforation. Currie et al teaches that it is particularly advantageous to employ hot pins to form perforations in cleaning sheets because the hot pins produce perforations which enhance the scrubbing ability of the sheet. See abstract and col. 2, lines 62-68. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed hot pins as the pins which formed the perforations in EP '463, motivated by the teaching of the prior art that it was conventional to use hot pins and that the use of hot pins improved the cleaning ability of the sheet.

3. While EP '463 teaches that the depth of the perforations can be controlled in order to allow for controlled release of the additive composition, EP '463 does not specifically teach that the perforations should extend less than about 50% of the thickness of the cleaning sheet. However, since EP '463 does teach that the size, depth and distribution of the perforations is related to the controlled release of the active agents which are added to the cleaning sheet, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the

particular depth of the perforations through the process of routine experimentation in order to arrive at a product which release the desired amount of additive.

4. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because EP '463 does not teach the particularly claimed number of cellulosic plies, does not teach that the abrasive structures comprise meltblown webs and does not teach how the cellulosic plies are formed. With regard to the number of plies, since the cellulosic plies are provided in order to provide softness and absorbency to the cleaning sheet, (page 5, lines 1-3; lines 22-32), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the appropriate number of plies through the process of routine experimentation in order to arrive at a cleaning sheeting having the optimum absorbency and softness.

5. With regard to the abrasive structure, EP '463 does not teach that the abrasive structures comprise meltblown webs, does not teach the particular types of nonwovens which make up the cellulosic plies and does not teach bonding by stitching, but instead teaches adhesive or heat bonding.

6. EP '974 teaches that cleaning sheets which comprise a plurality of nonwoven layers can comprise meltblown webs, coforms, spunbondeds, carded web, as well as air laid and wet laid webs. Cellulosic layers can be used as the cleaning layers, while synthetic polymers can form the scrubbing layers. See paragraphs 0011 – 0026. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed the particular types of nonwovens for the

abrasive layer and the cellulosic layers of EP '463, motivated by the teaching of EP '974 that such materials were recognized in the art as suitable for this purpose.

7. With regard to stitching, EP '463 teaches heat and/or adhesive bonding to unite the layers. EP '974 teaches that besides heat and adhesive bonding that stitching can also be used to bond the layers of the cleaning sheet together. See paragraph 0026. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed stitching rather than adhesive or thermal bonding to join the layers of the cleaning sheet of EP '463, motivated by the teaching of EP '974 that stitching was an art recognized equivalent means of joining layers.

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-67 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-50 of copending Application No. 10/745,327 in view of EP 066463 in view of Srinivasan et al, U.S Patent NO. 6,025,050, Currie et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,429,854 and Vinson et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,830,317. '327 discloses a wiping product comprising a

plurality of plies wherein some of the plies comprise cellulosic pulp fibers. '327 differs from the claimed invention because it does not teach perforating the plies. EP '463 teaches that perforating the plies of a wiping sheet allows for the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc.,. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have perforated the layers of US '327, motivated by the expectation that this would allow the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc., which are added to the wiping sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing pins to form the perforations, (see page 8, lines 20-32), it does not teach that the pins are heated, which would produce perforations which enhance the structural integrity of the layered material. Srinivasan teaches at col. 1, lines 30-35, that it is conventional to form apertured nonwoven fabrics by aperturing using hot pin perforation. Currie et al teaches that it is particularly advantageous to employ hot pins to form perforations in cleaning sheets because the hot pins produce perforations which enhance the scrubbing ability of the sheet. See abstract and col. 2, lines 62-68. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed hot pins as the pins which formed the perforations in EP '463, motivated by the teaching of the prior art that it was conventional to use hot pins and that the use of hot pins improved the cleaning ability of the sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing cellulosic fibers, it does not teach employing high yield cellulosic fibers. Vinson teaches at col. 2, lines 28-35, that high yield cellulosic fibers such as mechanical or chemi-mechanical pulps can be used to

replace virgin chemical pulp fibers in order to reduce consumption of forest products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted high yield fibers for the cellulosic fibers of EP '463, in order to reduce consumption of forest products.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

10. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-67 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-91 of copending Application No. 10/733,169 in view of EP 066463 . in view of Srinivasan et al, U.S Patent NO. 6,025,050, Currie et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,429,854 and Vinson et al, U.S. Patent NO. 5,830,317. US '169 discloses a scrubbing product comprising a plurality of plies some of which have abrasive properties. US '199 327 differs from the claimed invention because it does not teach perforating the plies. EP '463 teaches that perforating the plies of a wiping sheet allows for the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have perforated the layers of US '169, motivated by the expectation that this would allow the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc., which are added to the wiping sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing pins to form the perforations, (see page 8, lines 20-32), it does not teach that the pins are heated, which would produce perforations which enhance the structural integrity of the layered material. Srinivasan teaches at col. 1, lines 30-35, that it is conventional to form

apertured nonwoven fabrics by aperturing using hot pin perforation. Currie et al teaches that it is particularly advantageous to employ hot pins to form perforations in cleaning sheets because the hot pins produce perforations which enhance the scrubbing ability of the sheet. See abstract and col. 2, lines 62-68. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed hot pins as the pins which formed the perforations in EP '463, motivated by the teaching of the prior art that it was conventional to use hot pins and that the use of hot pins improved the cleaning ability of the sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing cellulosic fibers, it does not teach employing high yield cellulosic fibers. Vinson teaches at col. 2, lines 28-35, that high yield cellulosic fibers such as mechanical or chemi-mechanical pulps can be used to replace virgin chemical pulp fibers in order to reduce consumption of forest products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted high yield fibers for the cellulosic fibers of EP '463, in order to reduce consumption of forest products.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

11. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-67 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-131 of copending Application No. 10/321,831 in view of EP 066,463 . in view of Srinivasan et al, U.S Patent NO. 6,025,050, Currie et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,429,854 and Vinson et al, U.S. Patent NO. 5,830,317. US '831 discloses a cleaning sheet

comprising a plurality of plies including an abrasive layer and cellulosic layers. US '831 differs from the claimed invention because it does not disclose perforating the plies. EP '463 teaches that perforating the plies of a wiping sheet allows for the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have perforated the layers of US '831 motivated by the expectation that this would allow the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc., which are added to the wiping sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing pins to form the perforations, (see page 8, lines 20-32), it does not teach that the pins are heated, which would produce perforations which enhance the structural integrity of the layered material. Srinivasan teaches at col. 1, lines 30-35, that it is conventional to form apertured nonwoven fabrics by aperturing using hot pin perforation. Currie et al teaches that it is particularly advantageous to employ hot pins to form perforations in cleaning sheets because the hot pins produce perforations which enhance the scrubbing ability of the sheet. See abstract and col. 2, lines 62-68. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed hot pins as the pins which formed the perforations in EP '463, motivated by the teaching of the prior art that it was conventional to use hot pins and that the use of hot pins improved the cleaning ability of the sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing cellulosic fibers, it does not teach employing high yield cellulosic fibers. Vinson teaches at col. 2, lines 28-35, that high yield cellulosic fibers such as mechanical or chemi-mechanical pulps can be used to

replace virgin chemical pulp fibers in order to reduce consumption of forest products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted high yield fibers for the cellulosic fibers of EP '463, in order to reduce consumption of forest products.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

12. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-67 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-220 of copending Application No. 10/322,277 in view of EP 066,463 in view of Srinivasan et al, U.S. Patent NO. 6,025,050, Currie et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,429,854 and Vinson et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,830,317 . US '277 discloses a scrubbing product comprising an abrasive layer and an absorbent layer wherein the absorbent layer can be a cellulosic web. US '277 differs from the claimed invention because it does not teach perforating the layers. EP '463 teaches that perforating the plies of a wiping sheet allows for the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have perforated the layers of US '277 motivated by the expectation that this would allow the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc., which are added to the wiping sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing pins to form the perforations, (see page 8, lines 20-32), it does not teach that the pins are heated, which would produce perforations which enhance the structural integrity of the layered material. Srinivasan teaches at col. 1, lines 30-35, that

it is conventional to form apertured nonwoven fabrics by aperturing using hot pin perforation. Currie et al teaches that it is particularly advantageous to employ hot pins to form perforations in cleaning sheets because the hot pins produce perforations which enhance the scrubbing ability of the sheet. See abstract and col. 2, lines 62-68. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed hot pins as the pins which formed the perforations in EP '463, motivated by the teaching of the prior art that it was conventional to use hot pins and that the use of hot pins improved the cleaning ability of the sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing cellulosic fibers, it does not teach employing high yield cellulosic fibers. Vinson teaches at col. 2, lines 28-35, that high yield cellulosic fibers such as mechanical or chemi-mechanical pulps can be used to replace virgin chemical pulp fibers in order to reduce consumption of forest products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted high yield fibers for the cellulosic fibers of EP '463, in order to reduce consumption of forest products.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

13. Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 25-67 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-132 of copending Application No. 10/036,736 in view of EP 066,463 in view of Srinivasan et al, U.S Patent NO. 6,025,050 ,Currie et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,429,854 and

Vinson et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,830,317. US '736 discloses an absorbent material comprising a plurality of plies of tissue paper. US '736 differs from the claimed invention because US '736 does not disclose perforating the layers. EP '463 teaches that perforating the plies of a wiping sheet allows for the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have perforated the layers of US '736, motivated by the expectation that this would allow the controlled release of additives such as detergents, etc., which are added to the wiping sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing pins to form the perforations, (see page 8, lines 20-32), it does not teach that the pins are heated, which would produce perforations which enhance the structural integrity of the layered material. Srinivasan teaches at col. 1, lines 30-35, that it is conventional to form apertured nonwoven fabrics by aperturing using hot pin perforation. Currie et al teaches that it is particularly advantageous to employ hot pins to form perforations in cleaning sheets because the hot pins produce perforations which enhance the scrubbing ability of the sheet. See abstract and col. 2, lines 62-68. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed hot pins as the pins which formed the perforations in EP '463, motivated by the teaching of the prior art that it was conventional to use hot pins and that the use of hot pins improved the cleaning ability of the sheet. EP '463 differs from the claimed invention because while EP '463 teaches employing cellulosic fibers, it does not teach employing high yield cellulosic fibers. Vinson teaches at col. 2, lines 28-35, that high yield cellulosic fibers

such as mechanical or chemi-mechanical pulps can be used to replace virgin chemical pulp fibers in order to reduce consumption of forest products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted high yield fibers for the cellulosic fibers of EP '463, in order to reduce consumption of forest products.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the claimed number of sheets would not be the result of routine experimentation and that it does not follow that one of ordinary skill in the art would perceive a reasonable chance of success in producing an article comprising an absorbent structure having the particularly claimed number of sheets and other characteristics. Applicant argues that EP '463 teaches a closed sandwich structure comprising two substrate layers bonded together in such a way as to create a plurality of compartments and that the stated advantage of using a porous material is in the context of identifying which flexible sheet materials are suitable for use in the two substrate layers. However, EP '463 teaches that the substrate layer may be compound substrate which comprise more than one layer, such as an outer absorbent layer and an inner impervious layer. The outer absorbent layer would function to provide absorbency and softness to the laminate. The person of ordinary skill in the art would be able to select the appropriate number and thickness of plies for use in forming such compound

layer in order to produce a material having the desired properties.

14. Applicant argues that even if one of ordinary skill in the art did attempt to use more than one layer it does not follow that one of ordinary skill in the art would perceive a reasonable chance of success in using at least eight, twelve or eighteen layers. However, it is noted that mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. In *re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). Applicant has not set forth any new and unexpected result which is produced by using the claimed number of absorbent sheets.

15. Applicant argues that adding additional layers would detract from the softness of the material. However, the use of additional layers which were loft, or soft, or creped, etc., would enhance the absorbency and cushioning properties of the cleaning sheet. Further, with regard to the use of high yield fibers, as noted above, Vinson teaches at col. 2, lines 28-35, that high yield cellulosic fibers such as mechanical or chemi-mechanical pulps can be used to replace virgin chemical pulp fibers in order to reduce consumption of forest products and therefore provides a motivation to substitute part of the fibers of EP '463 with high yield fibers. Further, it is not apparent that 5 percent of high yield fibers would have a deleterious effect on softness and might produce a loftier product due to their being less flaccid. A loftier product would have a softer, more absorbent hand.

16. Applicant argues that the limitation that one set of apertures can be formed in one side and another set in another side where the two sets are offset has not been

addressed in the rejection. However, the rejection clearly states that the plies of cellulosic material of EP '463 comprise a plurality of perforations. The perforations have a size of 0.01-1.2 mm. The perforations are distributed at a rate of 0.5-5 perforations per square centimeter. See page 9, lines 1-13. The apertures can extend through less than the entire thickness of the cleaning sheet. See page 6, lines 9-12. The perforations can extend from one or both sides of the cleaning sheet. See page 8, lines 28-32. . The size and depth of the perforations can be controlled to allow for a metered release of the added components. See page 3, lines 17-23. Therefore, the rejection discusses the limitations regarding the apertures being present on one or both sides of the cleaning sheet and controlling the size and depth to allow for a particular release of the components. If different release was desired for different sides of the cleaning sheet the apertures would be disposed differently in terms of size or depth.

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

The examiner's supervisor Rena Dye may be reached at (571) 272-3186.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

/Elizabeth M. Cole/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

e.m.c